

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**1.) Claim Amendments**

The Applicants have amended claims 26-28; claims 1-19, 29, and 30 have been canceled; and claims 31-38 have been added. Accordingly, claims 20-28 and 31-38 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**2.) Allowable Subject Matter**

The Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 20-25.

**3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-7, 11 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Caves, et al. (US 6,434,151). Claims 1-2, 4-7, 11 and 14-17 have been canceled.

**4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caves in view of Subbiah (US 6,717,948). Claims 3 and 18 have been canceled.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8-10, 12-13, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caves in view of Oestreich (US 6,349,197). Of these claims, claims 8-10 and 12-13 have been canceled. The Applicants have amended claims 26-28 to better distinguish the claimed invention from Caves and Oestreich. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicants note that the Examiner allowed claims 20-25 because the prior art fails to describe a mapping means wherein the mapping is performed specifically in accordance with the description outlined in Table 2 of the specification. Claims 26-28 have been amended to recite in different form, the mapping functionality of Table 2, wherein an AMR-encoding format profile is selected based on User-to-User Indication

information and Length Indicator information. These claims have been further amended to recite that the User-to-User Indication information and the Length Indicator information is included in the header of the ATM Convergence Sublayer Protocol Data Unit which is sent to the second telecommunications node. The second telecommunications node then uses the header information to select the AMR-encoding format profile for reconstructing the AMR-encoded packet.

The Applicants contend these features are not taught or suggested by Caves or Oestreich. Basis for the amendments is found in the original application in Figure 2; page 9, line 27 through page 10, line 19; Table 2; and page 11, line 4 through page 12, line 10. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 103 rejection and the allowance of amended claims 26-28 are respectfully requested.

#### **5.) New Claims**

Claims 31-38 have been added. Independent claims 31 and 36 each recite the mapping functionality of Table 2, wherein an AMR-encoding format profile is selected based on User-to-User Indication information and Length Indicator information. These claims have been further amended to recite that the User-to-User Indication information and the Length Indicator information is included in the header of the ATM Convergence Sublayer Protocol Data Unit which is sent to the second telecommunications node.

The Applicants contend these features are not taught or suggested by Caves or Oestreich. Basis for the amendments is found in the original application in Figure 2; page 9, line 27 through page 10, line 19; Table 2; and page 11, line 4 through page 12, line 10. Therefore, the allowance of new claims 31-38 is respectfully requested.

#### **6.) Prior Art Not Relied Upon**


In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon (Lancelot and Lim) is considered pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure. However, Applicants' reading of these references has not revealed any teaching of the claimed invention as recited in the allowed, amended, and new claims.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 20-28 and 31-38.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Sidney L. Weatherford  
Registration No. 45,602

Date: January 4, 2007

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656  
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com